

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

RYAN WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff,

v.

LA VIE RESIDENCES, THOMPSON and
MICHEL ASSOCIATES, TAMINA SAIQ,
HOLLY DAVIS,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:24-cv-01554-JAD-EJY

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

On August 22, 2024 Plaintiff filed an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (“IFP”) together with a Complaint. ECF Nos. 1, 1-1. Four days later, the Court entered an Order granting Plaintiff’s IFP and dismissing his Complaint without prejudice and with leave to file an amended complaint no later than September 27, 2024. ECF No. 3. In the same Order the Court recommended Plaintiff’s claims under 18 U.S.C. § 1040 and Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act against Tamina Saiq and Holly Davis be dismissed with prejudice. *Id.* at 4-5. On September 11, 2024, the District Judge adopted the recommendation in full confirming Plaintiff had until September 27, 2024 to file an amended complaint. ECF No. 5. As of the date of this Report and Recommendation, Plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or otherwise communicated with the Court.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this matter be DISMISSED without prejudice for failure to comply with the Court’s Orders.

Dated this 7th day of October, 2024.


ELAYNA J. YOUCHAH
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

NOTICE

Pursuant to Local Rule IB 3-2, any objection to this Finding and Recommendation must be in writing and filed with the Clerk of the Court within fourteen (14) days. The Supreme Court has held that the courts of appeal may determine that an appeal has been waived due to the failure to file objections within the specified time. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 142 (1985). This circuit has also held that (1) failure to file objections within the specified time and (2) failure to properly address and brief the objectionable issues waives the right to appeal the District Court's order and/or appeal factual issues from the order of the District Court. *Martinez v. Ylst*, 951 F.2d 1153, 1157 (9th Cir. 1991); *Britt v. Simi Valley United Sch. Dist.*, 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983).